



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/988,811	11/20/2001	Nick Steele	17331-0010	8011

20786 7590 01/23/2006
KING & SPALDING LLP
191 PEACHTREE STREET, N.E.
45TH FLOOR
ATLANTA, GA 30303-1763

EXAMINER

CANGIALOSI, SALVATORE A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3621

DATE MAILED: 01/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/988,811

Applicant(s)

STEELE ET AL.

Examiner

Salvatore Cangialosi

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 November 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8,43-48 and 60-67 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8,43-48 and 60-67 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/24/03

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 3621

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

2. Claims 1-8, 43-48, 60-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Cook (6725050) or Catan (6491217) alone or further in view of Rosenthal et al (5737701).

Regarding claim 1, Cook (See abstract, Figs. 1-3, 6, 9, Col. 2, lines 20-55, Col. 5, lines 40-60, Col. 8, lines 20-25) or Catan (See Figs. 1, 4, 6A-9, 11-13, 20, 22, Col. 7, lines 1-45) both disclose a method for a wireless mobile device performing an information transaction based upon user entered input and authenticating with a server substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of promotional code. It is noted that the information input by the user into the mobile wireless device is believed to be the functional equivalent of a promotional code. Rosenthal et

Art Unit: 3621

al (See Figs. 1-5) show a method for wireless transactions authentication including a server. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Cook or Catan because the input code elements are conventional functional equivalents. Regarding the instruction limitations of claim 2, the use of the digital environment in the wireless devices of the prior art is a functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding authentication limitations of claim 3, Cook (See abstract, Figs. 1-3, 6, 9, Col. 2, lines 20-55, Col. 5, lines 40-60, Col. 8, lines 20-25) or Catan (See Figs. 1, 4, 6A-9, 11-13, 20, 22, Col. 7, lines 1-45) both disclose a wireless mobile device performing an information transaction based upon user entered input and authenticating with a server is a functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding code limitations of claim 4, Cook (See abstract, Figs. 1-3, 6, 9, Col. 2, lines 20-55, Col. 5, lines 40-60, Col. 8, lines 20-25) or Catan (See Figs. 1, 4, 6A-9, 11-13, 20, 22, Col. 7, lines 1-45) both disclose a wireless mobile device performing an information transaction based upon user entered input and authenticating with a server based on client device identification is a functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding the promotional limitations of claims 5-6, Cook (See abstract, Figs. 1-3, 6, 9, Col. 2, lines 20-55, Col. 5, lines 40-60, Col. 8, lines 20-25) or Catan (See Figs. 1, 4, 6A-9, 11-13, 20, 22, Col. 7, lines 1-45) both disclose a wireless mobile device performing an information

Art Unit: 3621

transaction based upon user entered input and authenticating with a server and including product promotions is a functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding database limitations of claims 7-8, Cook (See abstract, Figs. 1-3, 6, 9, Col. 2, lines 20-55, Col. 5, lines 40-60, Col. 8, lines 20-25) or Catan (See Figs. 1, 4, 6A-9, 11-13, 20, 22, Col. 7, lines 1-45) both disclose a wireless mobile device performing an information transaction based upon user entered input and authenticating with a server including databases is a functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding claim 43, Cook (See abstract, Figs. 1-3, 6, 9, Col. 2, lines 20-55, Col. 5, lines 40-60, Col. 8, lines 20-25) or Catan (See Figs. 1, 4, 6A-9, 11-13, 20, 22, Col. 7, lines 1-45) both disclose a means for a wireless mobile device performing an information transaction based upon user entered input and authenticating with a server substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of promotional code. It is noted that the information input by the user into the mobile wireless device is believed to be the functional equivalent of a promotional code. Rosenthal et al (See Figs. 1-5) show a method for wireless transactions authentication including a server. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Cook or Catan because the input code elements are conventional functional equivalents. Regarding account limitations of claim 44, Cook (See abstract, Figs. 1-3,

Art Unit: 3621

6, 9, Col. 2, lines 20-55, Col. 5, lines 40-60, Col. 8, lines 20-25) or Catan (See Figs. 1, 4, 6A-9, 11-13, 20, 22, Col. 7, lines 1-45) both disclose a wireless mobile device performing an information transaction based upon user entered input and authenticating with a server and is based on the client server model including separate files for each which is a functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding the promotional limitations of claim 45, Cook (See abstract, Figs. 1-3, 6, 9, Col. 2, lines 20-55, Col. 5, lines 40-60, Col. 8, lines 20-25) or Catan (See Figs. 1, 4, 6A-9, 11-13, 20, 22, Col. 7, lines 1-45) both disclose a wireless mobile device performing an information transaction based upon user entered input and authenticating with a server and including product promotions is a functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding wireless limitations of claim 46, Cook (See abstract, Figs. 1-3, 6, 9, Col. 2, lines 20-55, Col. 5, lines 40-60, Col. 8, lines 20-25) or Catan (See Figs. 1, 4, 6A-9, 11-13, 20, 22, Col. 7, lines 1-45) both disclose a wireless mobile device performing an information transaction based upon user entered input and authenticating with a server within a network including gateways is a functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding wireless device limitations of claim 47, Cook (See abstract, Figs. 1-3, 6, 9, Col. 2, lines 20-55, Col. 5, lines 40-60, Col. 8, lines 20-25) or Catan (See Figs. 1, 4, 6A-9, 11-13, 20, 22, Col. 7, lines 1-45) both disclose a wireless mobile device(i.e. cell phone)

Art Unit: 3621

performing an information transaction based upon user entered input and authenticating with a server is a functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding authentication limitations of claim 48, Cook (See abstract, Figs. 1-3, 6, 9, Col. 2, lines 20-55, Col. 5, lines 40-60, Col. 8, lines 20-25) or Catan (See Figs. 1, 4, 6A-9, 11-13, 20, 22, Col. 7, lines 1-45) both disclose a wireless mobile device performing an information transaction based upon user entered input and authenticating with a server prior to data exchange is a functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding claim 60, Cook (See abstract, Figs. 1-3, 6, 9, Col. 2, lines 20-55, Col. 5, lines 40-60, Col. 8, lines 20-25) or Catan (See Figs. 1, 4, 6A-9, 11-13, 20, 22, Col. 7, lines 1-45) both disclose a method for a wireless mobile device performing an information transaction including a payment based upon user entered input and authenticating with a server substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of promotional code. It is noted that the information input by the user into the mobile wireless device is believed to be the functional equivalent of a promotional code. Rosenthal et al (See Figs. 1-5) show a method for wireless transactions authentication including a server. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Cook or Catan because the input code elements are conventional functional equivalents. Regarding preference limitations of claims 61-62,

Serial Number: 09/988,811

7

Art Unit: 3621

Cook (See abstract, Figs. 1-3, 6, 9, Col. 2, lines 20-55, Col. 5, lines 40-60, Col. 8, lines 20-25) or Catan (See Figs. 1, 4, 6A-9, 11-13, 20, 22, Col. 7, lines 1-45) both disclose a wireless mobile device performing an information transaction based upon user entered input and authenticating with a server prior to data exchange based on user preferences to eliminate unwanted data spamming is a functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding authentication limitations of claims 63-65, Cook (See abstract, Figs. 1-3, 6, 9, Col. 2, lines 20-55, Col. 5, lines 40-60, Col. 8, lines 20-25) or Catan (See Figs. 1, 4, 6A-9, 11-13, 20, 22, Col. 7, lines 1-45) both disclose a wireless mobile device performing an information transaction based upon user entered input and authenticating with a server prior to data exchange is a functional equivalent of the claimed limitations. Regarding the vendor promotional limitations of claims 66-67, Cook (See abstract, Figs. 1-3, 6, 9, Col. 2, lines 20-55, Col. 5, lines 40-60, Col. 8, lines 20-25) or Catan (See Figs. 1, 4, 6A-9, 11-13, 20, 22, Col. 7, lines 1-45) both disclose a wireless mobile device performing an information transaction based upon user entered input and authenticating with a server and including product promotions is a functional equivalent of the claimed limitations.

Examiner's Note: Although Examiner has cited particular columns, line numbers and figures in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant(s), the

Art Unit: 3621

specified citations are merely representative of the teaching of the prior art that are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim and other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that the applicant(s), in preparing the response, fully consider the items of evidence in their entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

3. Claims 1-8, 43-48, 60-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. . 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Certain claims (1, 43, 60) contain the terms "can be accessed...accessible... accessible and modifiable...indicating a desire" which are not positive limitations. (See In re Collier, 158 USPQ 266) It is not clear what is being claimed. The claims require only a possibility rather than an actual limitation. For example, anything is possible given sufficient time and resources.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Salvatore Cangialosi at telephone number **(571) 272-6927**. The examiner can normally be reached 6:30 Am to 5:00 PM, Tuesday through Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell, can be reached at **(571) 272-6712**.

Serial Number: 09/988,811

9

Art Unit: 3621

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to (571)273-8300

Hand delivered responses should be brought to

United States Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 3600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (571) 272-3600.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system,

Serial Number: 09/988,811

10

Art Unit: 3621

see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


SALVATORE CANGIALOSI
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 222